

JODY A. LANDRY, Bar No. 125743
jlandry@littler.com
LINDSEY M. STEVENS, Bar No. 265700
lstevens@littler.com
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
501 W. Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, California 92101.3577
Telephone: 619.232.0441/ Fax: 619.232.4302

Attorneys for Defendant
ECOLAB INC.

STEVEN G. ZIEFF (SBN 84222)
DAVID A. LOWE (SBN 178811)
JOHN T. MULLAN (SBN 221149)
RUDY EXELROD ZIEFF & LOWE LLP
351 California Street, Suite 700
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 434-9800 / Fax (415) 434-0513
sgz@rezlaw.com
dal@rezlaw.com
jtm@rezlaw.com

TODD JACKSON (SBN 202598)
LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAKER
& JACKSON, P.C.
476 9th Street
Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: (510) 839-6824 / Fax (510) 839-7839
tjackson@lewisfeinberg.com

*COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF CONTINUED
ON FOLLOWING PAGE*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND/SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

NICK CANCELLA, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ECOLAB INC., a corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. CV 12 3001 CRB

**ORDER
STIPULATION TO MODIFY PORTIONS
OF COLLECTIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT AND TO TAKE
MOTION TO STAY OFF CALENDAR**

District Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
Ct. 6

Complaint Filed: June 11, 2012
Trial Date: Not Set

1 JAMES M. FINBERG (SBN 114850)
ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
2 177 Post Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94108
3 Telephone: (415) 421-7151
Facsimile: (415) 362-8064
4 jfinberg@altshulerberzon.com

5 ROBERT S. NELSON (SBN 220984)
NELSON LAW GROUP
6 26 West Portal Avenue, Suite 1
San Francisco, CA 94127
7 Telephone: (415) 702-9869
Facsimile: (415) 592-8671
8 rnelson@nelsonlawgroup.net

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 NICK CANCELLA, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Plaintiff NICK CANCELLA ("Plaintiff") and Defendant ECOLAB INC. ("Ecolab" or
2 "Defendant") hereby stipulate as follows, through their attorneys of record:

3 **I. BACKGROUND FACTS**

4 Plaintiff filed this Complaint on June 11, 2012. In paragraph 4 of his Complaint Plaintiff
5 sought to "certify a Rule 23 class of all similarly situated persons who work, or have worked, as
6 Service Specialists in California." Complaint ¶ 4 (Docket 1). Based on that allegation, on July 30,
7 2012, Defendant moved to stay the portion of this matter that sought relief for a putative Rule 23
8 class of California Service Specialists for alleged violations of the California Labor Code. (Docket
9 13). The basis for the motion was that this proposed class of Service Specialists was already
10 certified in a matter pending in the Central District of California (the "*Ladore* Action").

11 Since receiving that motion to stay, Plaintiff's counsel has indicated that the allegation in
12 paragraph 4 with respect to "California Service Specialists" was in error. Plaintiff's counsel has
13 explained that the Rule 23 class is limited only to "California Service Specialist Trainees" as defined
14 in paragraph 30 of the Complaint.

15 **II. STIPULATION**

16 In light of the above facts the parties agree to and do hereby stipulate as follows:

17 A. By August 20, 2012, Plaintiff will file a First Amended Complaint making only the
18 following changes:

- 19 1. The second sentence of Paragraph 2 will be modified to read as follows:
20 "Plaintiff specifically alleges that Defendant unlawfully classified all persons
21 who are employed, or have been employed during the relevant time period, in
22 the Service Specialist and Service Specialist Trainee positions ('Covered
23 Employees') as exempt from the FLSA and unlawfully classified the Service
24 Specialist Trainee position as exempt under California law requiring premium
and/or double-time pay for all overtime hours worked."
- 25 2. The word "Trainees" shall be inserted in paragraph 4 of the Complaint after
26 "Service Specialist" and before "in California".

27 B. Once made the changes to the Complaint outlined above completely removes from
28 this action the wage and hour claims of California Service Specialists under the California Labor
Code that are at issue in the *Ladore* Action.

1 C. Based upon this Stipulation and the soon to be filed First Amended Complaint,
2 Ecolab's motion to stay is moot and can be taken off calendar. Ecolab's contemporaneous Motion to
3 Transfer Venue remains at issue and on the calendar.

4 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

5
6 Dated: August 10, 2012

7 /s/ Jody A. Landry
8 JODY A. LANDRY
9 LINDSEY M. STEVENS
10 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
11 Attorneys for Defendant
12 ECOLAB INC.

13
14 Dated: August 10, 2012

15 /s/ John T. Mullan (with permission)
16 STEVEN G. ZIEFF
17 DAVID A. LOWE
18 JOHN T. MULLAN
19 RUDY EXELROD ZIEFF & LOWE LLP
20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
21 NICK CANCELLA

22
23 Dated: August 10, 2012

24 /s/ James M. Finberg (with permission)
25 JAMES M. FINBERG
26 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff
28 NICK CANCELLA

29 August 20, 2012

